

### DRAWING AMENDMENTS

An additional drawing sheet has been provided. The total number of drawing sheets is now two.

Attachments:        One New Sheet  
                         One Replacement Sheet  
                         Two Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 4-6 are now in the application. Claims 4-6 are subject to examination  
Claims 4 and 6 have been amended. Claim 7 has been canceled to facilitate  
prosecution of the instant application.

Claim limitations that were in the preamble of claim 4 have been moved into the  
method step defined in the body of claim 4. Certain claim limitations have been  
canceled from claim 6. It is believed to be clear that new matter has not been  
presented and that a new issue requiring further search or consideration has  
not been presented. Therefore, entry of the amendment to the claims after the  
final rejection is requested.

Under the heading "Informalities or Claim Objections" on page 2 of the above-  
identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings.

The at least one connector strip 5, 6 is shown in Fig. 1. The fixing strip 7 is  
shown in Fig. 2.

The one profile blank and the plurality of tubular base bodies have been  
removed from the claims by canceling claim 7. The superfluous material from  
the fixing strip has been canceled from claim 6. No new matter or new issue

requiring further consideration or search has been presented by the cancelation of this material.

Fig. 4 has been added to show the superfluous material that is removed from the second connector strip 6 as shown in Fig. 3. Support for the figure can be found by referring to Figs. 1 and 3 and page 6, lines 26-30 of the specification.

Fig. 5 has been added to show first and second extruding dies. Support for the figure can be found by referring to claim 5.

The Examiner has stated that a profile-extruder must be shown. That term, however, is not used in the claims. Applicants do point out that a first and a second extruding die are now shown in Fig. 5.

It is believed that the all of the objections to the drawings have been overcome.

The specification has been amended to refer to the added drawings.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC§103" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 4 and 6 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,705,083 to Vennemeyer et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,899,712 to De Bruyn et al. and U.S. Patent No. 3,795,970 to Keathley et al. under 35 U.S.C. §103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As pointed out above, the material in the preamble of claim 4 has been added into the method step defined in the body of the claim.

The Examiner has stated that if the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Applicants, however, have not claimed a structural element having features that could be satisfied by some other device having the same structure. Rather, applicants have claimed a **method** that includes a step of forming a high-pressure fuel accumulator for a fuel injection system of an internal combustion engine. This is accomplished by forming a tubular base body together with at least one fuel supply port for a fuel supply, at least one fuel discharge port for a fuel discharge.

These claimed method steps are not mere intended use of a claimed structural device, but rather serve to define the boundaries of the actual invention and are entitled to patentable weight.

Vennemeyer et al. do not teach a step of forming a high-pressure fuel accumulator for a fuel injection system of an internal combustion engine, wherein the fuel accumulator has fuel supply and discharge ports.

Vennemeyer et al. teach forming a master cylinder 22 of a hydraulic braking system 20 (See column 3, lines 37-53).

The master cylinder 22 will be mounted to a reservoir 26 to receive hydraulic brake fluid, and the master cylinder 22 will be connected to hydraulic fluid lines

for transporting the hydraulic brake fluid to brake cylinders or calipers. Pistons 28 are disposed in the master cylinder 22 in order to move hydraulic fluid into and out of the master cylinder 22.

The method for forming the master cylinder 22, which is taught by Vennemeyer et al., clearly does not include a step of forming a tubular base body of a high-pressure fuel accumulator together with a fuel supply port, a fuel discharge port, and a fixing element as a one-piece integral component.

Even if De Bruyn et al. and Keathley et al. did suggest the modifications to Vennemeyer et al. as alleged by the Examiner, the claimed invention would not have been suggested.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC§103" on page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 5 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,705,083 to Vennemeyer et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,899,712 to De Bruyn et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,795,970 to Keathley et al. and further in view of Official Notice under 35 U.S.C. §103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The invention as defined by claim 5 would not have been suggested for the reasons specified above with regard to the teaching in Vennemeyer et al.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC§ 103" on page 5 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 7 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,705,083 to Vennemeyer et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,899,712 to De Bruyn et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,795,970 to Keathley et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,319,849 to Bloecker under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 7 has been canceled.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 4. Claim 4 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 4.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 4-6 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Appl. No. 10/536,924  
Reply to Office Action of February 20, 2009  
Amdt. Dated May 20, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/  
Mark P. Weichselbaum  
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

May 20, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP  
P.O. Box 2480  
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480  
Tel.: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101